



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,678	09/21/2006	Jerome Berger	1485-000016/US/NP	5636
27572	7590	11/16/2009		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 828			RICCI, CRAIG D	
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief		Application No. 10/593,678	Applicant(s) BERGER ET AL.
		Examiner CRAIG RICCI	Art Unit 1628
<p>–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –</p> <p>THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</p> <p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p> <p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p> <p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p> <p>AMENDMENTS</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p> <p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____. Claim(s) objected to: _____. Claim(s) rejected: _____. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p> <p>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p> <p>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached <i>Information Disclosure Statement(s)</i>. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. </p>			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claims are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that Domard et al does not teach homogenously reacetylated chitosan (Applicant Argument, Pages 9-11). Since it is not clear whether or not Domard et al specifically teaches homogenously reacetylated chitosan, Applicants' argument as to this point is considered persuasive. However, as discussed in the previous Action, it would have been prima facie obvious to homogenously reacetylate chitosan taught by Domard et al in view of Baumann et al. Applicants, however, argue that "Baumann does not teach a homogenously reacetylated chitosan having a molecular weight of not smaller than 200 kDa and a deacetylation degree of 30-60% obtained from the reacetylation of chitosan having a deacetylation degree of 80-90%" (Applicant Argument). However, Applicants are reminded that one can not show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. In the previous Action, Baumann et al was used in combination with Domard et al to motivate the homogenous reacetylation of chitosan. Applicants' argument that Baumann et al do not provide guidance for achieving homogenous reacetylation is not considered persuasive since it is asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to carry out our said homogenous reacetylation absent guidance. Applicants also argue that Baumann et al teach other techniques or concepts to apply or consider when working with chitosan and it is improper to cite the reference for one of these. Applicants' argument is not found persuasive. Simply because a reference discloses multiple techniques or concepts would not limit one of ordinary skill in the art from using one of those techniques or concepts without applying all of said techniques and concepts. No where does Baumann et al indicate the set of guidelines is an "all or none" list as characterized by Applicants and one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably construe the disclosure of Baumann et al as such. Applicants again argue that Baumann et al teaches away from the recited chitosan. Although Baumann et al may indicate some advantages for low molecular weight chitosan over high molecular weight chitosan, Baumann et al do not criticize, discredit or otherwise discourage the recited high molecular weight chitosan. As such, Applicants' arguments are not found persuasive. As to Applicants' assertion that the prior art does not teach chitosan of more than 200 kDa, Applicants' arguments absent evidence are not considered persuasive. Applicants are advised to provide evidentiary support for the assertion that chitosan from the squid endoskeletan is less than 200 kDa. Furthermore, as previously discussed, it would have been obvious to use high molecular weight chitosan in view of Nettles et al. As to Nettles et al, Applicants are again reminded that one can not show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. Applicants further argue that the use limitation of claims 10 and 22 result in structural differences between the claimed invention and prior art. However, this is not found persuasive. Applicants have merely claimed "homogenously reacetylated chitosan having a molecular weight of not smaller than 200 kDa and a deacetylation degree of 30-60%". As previously discussed, Domard teaches reacetylated chitosan having a deacetylation degree of 30-60%. Furthermore, in view of Baumann et al and Nettles et al, it would have been obvious to use homogenous reacetylation and high molecular weight chitosan (i.e., not smaller than 200 kDa). Applicants' additional arguments limited to the process within the product-by-process claims are not considered relevant since said process carries no patentable weight.